

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Telephonic Interview and Interview Summary

The undersigned thanks Examiner Ryman for the courtesy of the telephonic interview on September 8, 2004. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's willingness to consider the application and move prosecution forward. Applicants note for the record, with regard to the Interview Summary mailed on September 9, 2004, that Applicants did not agree that any claims discussed would be obvious. Applicants reserve the right to pursue additional claims in later applications.

Drawings

The Specification has been amended to include mention of reference sign STEP 40, i.e., the selecting of a node by the first node, which is shown in Figure 9. As a result, changes to the Figures are not required. No new matter has been added.

Claim Status

Prior to entry of this Amendment and Response, claims 1–3, 5–17, and 19–27 were pending in this application. In the Office action, claims 1–3, 5–17, and 19–27 were rejected, and claims 5, 10, 19, 23, and 24 were objected to for informalities. In this Amendment and Response, claims 1, 5, 9, 10, 14, 15, 19, 23, and 24 are amended. Support for these amendments may be found, at least, for example, in the claims as originally filed, and in the specification at pages 8-9. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

Upon entry of this Amendment and Response, claims 1–3, 5–17, and 19–27 will be pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the objections and rejections in light of the amendments and comments made here.

Claim Objections

Claims 5, 10, 19, 23, and 24 were objected to for informalities. Applicants submit that the foregoing amendments resolve the objections.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 10 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as indefinite. The amendments to claims 10 and 24 should address the rejections.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1–3, 5–17, and 19–27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,041,049 to Brady (“Brady”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,007,052 to Flammer (“Flammer”).

Amended claims 1 and 15 each recites, in part,

“... wherein the method facilitates discovery of all cooperating nodes in the network of nodes within a number of repetitions that is proportional to the square of the logarithm of the number of cooperating nodes.”

Amended claim 14 recites, in part,

“... wherein the system facilitates discovery by each cooperating node of all cooperating nodes in the network of nodes within a number of triggerings that is proportional to the square of the logarithm of the number of cooperating nodes.”

Neither Brady nor Flammer teach or suggest discovery of cooperating nodes within a number of “repetitions” or “triggerings” that is “proportional to the square of the logarithm of the number of cooperating nodes.” Applicants note that the Interview Summary indicated:

“Applicant suggested amending Version B to state ‘within O log N number of repetitions’. Examiner indicated that such an amendment would overcome the cited prior art.”

Since elements of each of amended claims 1, 14, and 15 are not taught or suggested by the cited art, these claims are patentable over Brady and Flammer.

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the dependent claims, claims 2, 3, 5–13, 16, 17, and 19–27, are patentable because they depend, directly or indirectly, on a

patentable base claim. These claims may also have other features not taught or suggested by the cited references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of claims 1-3, 5-17, and 19-27 in due course. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative by telephone at the number listed below to discuss any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,



Ira V. Heffner
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 41,059

Date: October 5, 2004
Testa, Hurwitz & Thibeault, LLP
High Street Tower
125 High Street
Boston, MA 02110
(617) 248-7176